



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Semitic ד , ג or ג , cf. Erman, *ÄG*, 3d ed., § 116. Cf. also the modern Arabic pronunciation of the name of Jerusalem, Udes (Udes) for Kudes , and the Aramaic אֲרָמָא , אֲרָמָא .

In like manner Egyptian g frequently represents Semitic ג or ג . This has given me the clue to another identification (not proposed here for the first time, see *BAR*, II, p. 187, note 1.), namely Nuges with Nuḥašše (the h of the cuneiform transcribing an ג , ג). It has already been suggested that Nuḥašše is the same as the נֶחֱשֶׁת of the ZKR-Inscription. Cf. Weidner, *op. cit.*, 77, n., and Dhorme, *Rev. bibl.*, 1908, 503. For the location of Nuhašše see *BAR*, III, § 309.

Duddul, *KBo.* I, No. 10, Obv. 42 (which appears as Duldul in my translation, *AJSL*, XXXVII, 201, through a typographical error), is obviously the Tutul of the Hammurabi Code, Col. IV, 30. Here the people of Mera (= Mari) and Tutul are mentioned.

Finally, in *KBo.* I, No. 1, Rev. 43, I should like to restore "Teshub of [Bam]biki." Bambyke is mentioned in a text in Johns, *ADD*, No. 773 (= K 180), l. 5.

D. D. LUCKENBILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A MESSENGER FROM IBLA

Our interest in the western Semites who wandered into the plain of Shinar, singly or collectively, has steadily increased since the time that Ranke called our attention to them in his *Personal Names*. With the publication of Poebel's *Historical Texts* a number of geographical terms gained new significance. The elder Sargon, according to his own inscriptions, extended his conquests westward over Mari, Yarmuti, and Ibla to the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountain. We know that Naram-Sin called himself conqueror of "Armanu and Ibla" (*RA*, Vol. X, p. 101, No. 1). My immediate interest is in certain citizens of Ibla. In the time of the Ur dynasty we begin to meet with individuals from this western city (country). Sometimes we have their names, sometimes not; so we hear of Ili-Dagan, the man of Ibla (Legrain, *Le temps des rois d'Ur*, p. 120), or again simply of a man of Ibla (Contenau, *Umma sous la dynastie d'Ur*, No. 27). While in Diwaniyah the other winter, I was able to make a few hasty notes of some cuneiform documents in the possession of the political officer of that district, Major (I hope he is at least a colonel by this time) C. K. Daly. One of these was a tablet dated in the forty-fourth year of Dungi (*mu ki-maš^{ki} u ġu-mur-ti^{ki} ba-ġul*). It had to do with offerings of "firstlings" of the flocks to different deities: 1 *silā* ^d*En-lil*, 1 *silā* ^d*Nin-lil*, *mu-du En-^dNinni*, 1 *silā* ^d*En-lil*, etc., 1 *maš* (?) *nitaġ*, 5 *udu nitaġ*, *Su-ri-im*, ^u*kin-gé-a* ^u*Ib-la^{ki}*, "One lamb for Enlil, one lamb for Ninlil, En-Ninni brought. One lamb for Enlil, etc., one fat kid (and) five fat sheep (were brought) by Surim, the

messenger from Ibla." Winckler would probably have regarded Surim as a good "Syrian (Suri)" name. I can make no such claim for it. But it is a West Semitic name from the time of Dungi, and as such worth recording.

D. D. LUCKENBILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ON BABYLONIAN-ASSYRIAN FEUDALISM (*ilku*)

The Assyrian *terminus technicus* for feudal benefice (*ilku*), is found in that section of the Hammurabi Code which deals with this subject (§§ 26-41; cf. *AJSL*, 36, 311).

Scholars agree in the spelling *ilku* = אִלְכּוּ, either deriving it from *alāku* (to go) (as Meissner, Ungnad, Harper, Pognon [*JA* XI, 1, 400], etc.) or postulating an identical, but otherwise unknown, root (Delitzsch).

Without discussing these unsatisfactory etymologies (which cannot explain the actual usage of the word) we suggest the spelling *ilku* = אִלְכּוּ¹ from the root אִלַּךְ (to divide).² This root³ is used in the Old Testament of divisions of land, food, booty, men (in squads), etc.⁴ *Ilku*, as the Hebr. אִלְכּוּ, means originally a *portion*: the *general* meaning is then in both languages narrowed to a *special* technical sense (plot of land); just as in English the word *share*, meaning originally a portion in general, comes to mean a fraction of the stock of a corporation. *Ilku* thus means the portion of land granted by a king to a faithful vassal⁵ and is applied: (1) to the real estate; (2) to the possessor; (3) to the management.

1. *Ilku* being always referred to feudal holdings, is in sharp contrast with *eklu* (which is derived by metathesis from the same root⁶ and means the privately owned portion of land). This is the ordinary meaning of the word in Cols. X-XII.

¹ The possibility of the spelling with a *k* was long ago recognized by Delitzsch (*AW*, 481).

² Ungnad (*ZA*, XVII, 354) taking for granted, for unknown reasons, that the word cannot be spelled with a *k* infers from HC, XII, 40 (*il-ku*) that *ku* should always be read *kum* in the HC!

³ אִלַּךְ (to divide) is a different root from אִלַּךְ (to be smooth). Possibly the first was אִלַּךְ and the second אִלַּךְ.

⁴ Metaphorically the root is used for divisions in opinion (Talmud), apportionment of earthly fate (Isa. 17:14; سَخِمُ) and heavenly bliss (Koran, Sur. III, 71). The Arabic خَلَقَ (to create) is from the same root. As Nöldeke pointed out (in *ZAW*, XX, 85 f.), in Hebr. Ben Sirach 38, 10; 39, 25; 44, 2 the Hebrew root is evolving in the direction of the Arabic, independently of Arabic influence.

⁵ Many records of such transactions have come down to us in the Kudurru or boundary-stones (see King, *Babylonian Boundary Stones*) and in contracts (Johns, *ADD*, Nos. 645-50).

⁶ Cf. Jäger (*BA*, II, 296) and Payne Smith (*Thes. Syr.* sub voce سَخِمُ). Metathesis is not an uncommon phonetic change in Semitic as well as Indo-European languages (especially with liquids); see for Semitic parallels J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 1 ff.; Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, I, 267 ff. Can we infer from the fact that *eklu* is always written ideographically, while *ilku* never is, that the latter was an institution unknown to the Sumerians?